UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,788	02/08/2001	Chuan-Cheng Chiu	4425-117	5857

2292 7590 03/01/2005

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER	
SCHLAIFER, JONATHAN D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/778,788	CHIU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jonathan D. Schlaifer	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 August 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *08 February 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to an Amendment to Application 09//778,788 filed on 8/31/2004, with no prior art filed.
2. Claims 1-19 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 10 are independent claims. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended. Claim 12 has been cancelled.
3. The rejections of claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
4. The rejections of claims 2-9 and 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krane (USPN 5,799,063—filing date 8/15/1996), further in view of Gaughan et al. (USPN 6,272,680 B1—filing date 4/18/2000), hereinafter Gaughan.**
6. **Regarding independent claim 1,** Krane discloses in col. 2, lines 30-41 a method for browsing on-line using numeric keys (links can be selected using a telephone keypad), said method comprising: sorting a plurality of hyperlinks displayed on a first web page; (this step is inherent to the displaying of the links in a browser); marking each said plurality of hyperlinks with a corresponding number (this would be inherent to allowing

selection via a numeric pad, since there are "access names" as in col. 2, line 36) receiving an input number from a remote control (the links can be selected and followed via a telephone keypad, which is remote from the computer); retrieving a second web page using one of the hyperlinks corresponding to the input number (the links can be selected and followed via a telephone keypad). Krane fails to disclose displaying the second web page using a television (the invention uses a monitor, which is a type of television). However, Gaughan in the Abstract, lines 1-20, discloses displaying web content on a television. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to display the web content from Krane on a television in the manner of Gaughan because it would have presented the information in a visually accessible manner.

7. **Regarding independent claim 10,** it is a system that carries out the method of claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale. The amendment refers to a set-top box, which is based solely on the position of the CPU in respect to the monitor/television, which is arbitrary.

8. **Regarding dependent claim 11,** it modifies claim 10 in a manner analogous to that which claim 9 modifies claim 6 (i.e. by using a remote controller), and is rejected under similar rationale.

9. **Claims 2 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krane, further in view of Gaughan, further in view of Chen et al. (USPN 4,173,832—filing date 3/15/1978), hereinafter Chen.**

10. **Regarding dependent claim 2,** Krane and Gaughan fail to disclose a method wherein said marked numbers alternate from being hidden to being displayed in response to a function key. However, Chen, in col. 5, lines 8-20, describes selective hiding of information in response to a push button in order to provide helpful visual feedback to a user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used selective hiding of information in response to a push button in order to have provided helpful visual feedback to a user in the manner of Chen in the context of Krane and Gaughan.
11. **Regarding dependent claim 15,** it modifies claim 10 in the manner in which claim 2 modifies claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
12. **Claim 3 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krane, , further in view of Gaughan, further in view of Chen, further in view of Slotznick (USPN 6,011,537—filing date 1/27/1998).**
13. **Regarding dependent claim 3,** Krane and Gaughan and Chen fail to disclose a method wherin said input number is used to activate the connection of the hyperlinks only when said marked numbers are displayed. However, Slotznick in col. 3, lines 48-67 discloses how hidden hyperlinks cannot be activated in order to permit complete loading of a page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to prevent activation of hidden hyperlinks in order to permit complete loading of a page.
14. **Regarding dependent claim 16,** it modifies claim 10 in the manner in which claim 3 modifies claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.

15. **Claims 4-5 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krane, further in view of Gaughan, further in view of Beyda et al. (USPN 6,004,326—filing date 5/12/1997), hereinafter Beyda.**

16. **Regarding dependent claim 4,** Krane and Gaughan fail to disclose a method wherein range of said marked numbers is less than a predetermined number. However, Beyda, in the Abstract, lines 1-15 reveals that a predetermined range is used to determine if hyperlinks are activated in an appropriate manner. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a predetermined range in the manner of Beyda in order to determine if hyperlinks are activated in an appropriate manner.

17. **Regarding dependent claim 5,** Krane and Gaughan and Beyda fail to explicitly disclose that said predetermined number is 100. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that two digits is a manageable number of digits to work with. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the predetermined number be 100 because it would have led to the marked numbers being 2 digits in length, which is a manageable number.

18. **Regarding dependent claim 13,** it modifies claim 10 in the manner in which claim 4 modifies claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.

19. **Regarding dependent claim 14,** it modifies claim 13 in the manner in which claim 5 modifies claim 4 and it is rejected under similar rationale.

20. **Claims 6-7, 9, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krane, further in view of Gaughan, further in view of D'Amico et al. (USPN 4,168,399—filing date 5/5/1978), hereinafter D'Amico.**

21. **Regarding dependent claim 6,** Krane and Gaughan fails to disclose a method wherein a key of an input device is pushed twice within a predetermined time to represent tens of said input number. However, in col. 5, lines 24-67 and col. 6, lines 1-21 D'Amico discloses pressing keys multiple times with delay to represent successive digits of a number in a user-friendly manner. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow pressing keys multiple times with delay to represent successive digits of a number in a user-friendly manner in the manner of D'Amico in the context of Krane and Gaughan.

22. **Regarding dependent claim 7,** Krane and Gaughan fails to disclose that the predetermined time is 0.5 second. However, the predetermined time of D'Amico is 0.5 second, which may be combined with Krane and Gaughan as in claim 6. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to to allow pressing keys multiple times with delay of 0.5 second to represent successive digits of a number in a user-friendly manner in the manner of D'Amico in the context of Krane and Gaughan.

23. **Regarding dependent claim 9,** Krane and Gaughan and D'Amico fail to disclose that said input device is a remote controller. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that remote controllers can be used to allow user-friendly input at a distance. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to use a remote controller with Krane and Gaughan and D'Amico in order to allow user-friendly input at a distance.

24. **Regarding dependent claim 17,** it modifies claim 10 in the manner in which claim 6 modifies claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.

25. **Regarding dependent claim 18,** it modifies claim 17 in the manner in which claim 7 modifies claim 6 and it is rejected under similar rationale.

26. **Claims 8 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krane, , further in view of Gaughan, further in view of Kuzma (USPN 5,832,506—filing date 3/29/1996).**

27. **Regarding dependent claim 8,** Krane and Gaughan fails to disclose a method further comprising sorting and marking at least one defined function displayed on the web page, so that the defined function is activated in response to the corresponding input number. However, in col. 4, lines 66-67 and col. 5, lines 1-7, Kuzma discloses linking functions to links in order to imbue them with additional capabilities. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to link functions with links in the context of Krane and Gaughan in the manner of Kuzma in order to imbue them with additional capabilities.

28. **Regarding dependent claim 19,** it modifies claim 10 in the manner in which claim 8 modifies claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

29. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

USPN 6,073,171 (filing date 1/23/1997)—Gaughan et al.

USPN 6,097,383 (filing date 1/23/1997)—Gaughan et al.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan D. Schlaifer whose telephone number is (571) 272-4129. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JS

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER